arXiv:0912.1757v1 [math.AC] 9 Dec 2009

# STRONGLY PRIME SUBMODULES

A. R. NAGHIPOUR

Abstract. Let $R$ be a commutative ring with identity. For an $R$-module $M$, the notion of strongly prime submodule of $M$ is defined. It is shown that this notion of prime submodule inherits most of the essential properties of the usual notion of prime ideal. In particular, the Generalized Principal Ideal Theorem is extended to modules.

## 0. Introduction

Throughout this paper all rings are commutative with identity and all modules are unitary. Also we consider $R$ to be a ring and $M$ a unitary $R$-module.

For a submodule $N$ of $M$, let $(N : M)$ denote the set of all elements $r$ in $R$ such that $rM \subseteq N$. Note that $(N : M)$ is an ideal of $R$, in fact, $(N : M)$ is the annihilator of the $R$-module $M/N$. A proper submodule $N$ of $M$ is called *prime* if $rx \in N$, for $r \in R$ and $x \in M$, implies that either $x \in N$ or $r \in (N : M)$. This notion of prime submodule was first introduced and systematically studied in Dauns (1978) and recently has received a good deal of attention from several authors, see for example Man and Smith (2002), McCasland and Smith (1993), McCasland et al. (1997) and Moore and Smith (2002).

In this article, we introduce a slightly different notion of prime submodule and call it strongly prime submodule. First of all, we bring a notation.

**Notation.** Let $N$ be a submodule of $M$ and let $x \in M$. We denote the ideal $(N + Rx : M)$ by $I_x^N$. Therefore, $I_x^N = \{r \in R | rM \subseteq N + Rx\}$.

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* 13A10, 13C99, 13E05.

*Key words and phrases.* Prime submodule, strongly prime submodule, strongly prime radical.

The author is supported by Shahrekord University.

Let $P$ be a proper submodule of $M$. We say that $P$ is a *strongly prime* submodule if $I_x^P y \subseteq P$, for $x, y \in M$, implies that either $x \in P$ or $y \in P$. We call a proper submodule $C$ of $M$ to be a *strongly semiprime* submodule if $I_x^C x \subseteq C$, for $x \in M$, implies that $x \in C$.

Note that if we consider $R$ as an $R$-module, then strongly prime (respectively, semiprime) submodules are exactly prime (respectively, semiprime) ideals of $R$.

Our definition of strongly prime (respectively, semiprime) submodule seems more natural, comparing to the usual notion of prime (respectively, semiprime) ideal of a ring. We will show that every strongly semiprime submodule of $M$ is an intersection of strongly prime submodules. Note that this result is not true for semiprime submodules, see Jenkins and Smith (1992).

This article consists of two sections. In the first section we prove some preliminary facts about strongly prime submodules, which one could expect. In Section 2, as an application of our result in Section 1, we state and prove a module version of the Generalized Principal Ideal Theorem.

## 1. Strongly Prime Submodules

We begin with the following proposition.

**Proposition 1.1.** *Let $M$ be an $R$-module. Then the following hold.*
*(1) Any strongly prime submodule of $M$ is prime.*
*(2) Any maximal submodule of $M$ is strongly prime.*

*Proof.* (1) Suppose on the contrary that $P$ is not a prime submodule. Then there exist $x \in M \setminus P$ and $r \in R$ such that $rx \in P$ and $rM \nsubseteq P$. So there exits $y \in M$ such that $ry \notin P$. We have

$$I_x^P ry = rI_x^P y \subseteq r(P + Rx) \subseteq P.$$

Since $P$ is a strongly prime submodule, we should have $x \in P$ or $ry \in P$, which is a contradiction.

(2) Let $x, y \in M$ and $I_x^P y \subseteq P$. If $x \notin P$, then $P + Rx = M$ and hence $I_x^P = R$. It follows that $y \in P$, which completes the proof. □

Before we continue, let us show that a prime submodule need not be a strongly prime (or even a strongly semiprime) submodule.

*Example* 1.2. Let $R$ be a ring and $\mathfrak{p} \in \mathrm{Spec}(R)$. Then $(\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p})$ is a prime submodule of the $R$-module $R \times R$. But it is not a strongly prime (or strongly semiprime) submodule because $I_{(1,0)}^{(\mathfrak{p},\mathfrak{p})}(1,0) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}(1,0) \subseteq (\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p})$, and $(1,0) \notin (\mathfrak{p}, \mathfrak{p})$.

**Notation.** The set of all strongly prime submodules of $M$ is denoted by $\text{S-Spec}_R(M)$.

**Proposition 1.3.** *Let $V$ be a vector space over a field $F$. Then*

$$\text{S-Spec}_F(V) = \{W | W \text{ is a maximal subspace of } V\}.$$

*Proof.* By the above proposition, every maximal subspace is strongly prime. For the converse, suppose to the contrary that $W$ is a strongly prime subspace of $V$ which is not a maximal subspace. Then there exists $x \in V \setminus W$ such that $Fx + W \neq V$. For any $y \in M$, we have

$$I_x^W y = \{r \in F | rV \subseteq Fx + W\} y = \{0\} y = \{0\} \subseteq W.$$

It follows that $y \in W$ and hence $W = V$, which is a contradiction. Thus every strongly prime subspace is maximal. □

Following Dauns (1980), we say that a proper submodule $N$ of an $R$-module $M$ is *semiprime* if whenever $r^2 x \in N$, where $r \in R$ and $x \in M$, then $rx \in N$. The ring $R$ is called *Max-ring* if every $R$-module has a maximal submodule. Max-Rings, which also called *B-rings*, were introduced by Hamsher (1967) and has been studied by several authors, see for example Camillo (1975), Faith (1973, 1995), Hirano (1998) and Koifmann (1970).

The following corollary provides characterizations of Max-rings.

**Corollary 1.4.** *Let $R$ be a ring. Then the following are equivalent.*

*(1) $R$ is Max-ring.*

*(2) Every $R$-module has a strongly prime submodule.*

*(3) Every $R$-module has a prime submodule.*

*(4) Every $R$-module has a semiprime submodule.*

*Proof.* (1)$\Longrightarrow$(2) and (2)$\Longrightarrow$(3) follow easily from Proposition 1.1.
(3)$\Longrightarrow$(4) is trivial and (4)$\Longrightarrow$(1) follows from Behboodi et al. (2004, Theorem 3.9). □

Next, we observe that strongly prime submodules behave naturally under localization.

**Theorem 1.5.** *Let $M$ be an $R$-module, and let $U$ be a multiplicatively closed subset of $R$. Then*

$$\text{S-Spec}_{U^{-1}R}U^{-1}M = \{U^{-1}P | P \in \text{S-Spec}_R M \ \text{ and } U^{-1}P \neq U^{-1}M\}.$$

*If, moreover, $M$ is finitely generated, then*

$$\text{S-Spec}_{U^{-1}R}U^{-1}M = \{U^{-1}P | P \in \text{S-Spec}_R M \ \text{ and } (P : M) \cap U = \emptyset\}.$$

*Proof.* First assume that $P \in \text{S-Spec}_R M$ and $U^{-1}P \neq U^{-1}M$. We show that $U^{-1}P \in \text{S-Spec}_{U^{-1}R}U^{-1}M$. Let $I^{U^{-1}P}_{x_1/u_1}x_2/u_2 \subseteq U^{-1}P$, where $x_1/u_1, x_2/u_2 \in U^{-1}M$. We claim that $I^P_{x_1}x_2 \subseteq P$. If $r \in I^P_{x_1}$, then $rM \subseteq P + Rx_1$ and hence

$$(r/1)U^{-1}M \subseteq U^{-1}P + U^{-1}R(x_1/1) = U^{-1}P + U^{-1}R(x_1/u_1).$$

Therefore $(r/1)(x_2/u_2) \subseteq U^{-1}P$ and so there exist $p \in P$ and $v_1, v_2 \in U$ such that $v_2(v_1 r x_2 - p u_2) = 0$. This implies that $(v_1 v_2) r x_2 \in P$. On the other hand, it is easy to see that $U^{-1}P \neq U^{-1}M$ implies $(P : M) \cap U = \emptyset$. So we have $r x_2 \in P$. Thus $I^P_{x_1}x_2 \subseteq P$. It follows that $x_1 \in P$ or $x_2 \in P$ and hence $(x_1/u_1) \in U^{-1}P$ or $(x_2/u_2) \in U^{-1}P$, as desired.

Now let $Q \in \text{S-Spec}_{U^{-1}R}U^{-1}M$. Set $P = \{x \in M | x/1 \in Q\}$. It is easy to see that $Q = U^{-1}P$ and $P \in \text{S-Spec}_R M$ and thus we are done.
For the second assertion, it is enough to show that $(P : M) \cap U = \emptyset$ implies that $U^{-1}P \neq U^{-1}M$. Suppose on the contrary that $U^{-1}P = U^{-1}M$. Since $M$ is finitely generated, we may assume that there exist elements $x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_n \in M$ that generate $M$. For each $1 \leq i \leq n$ there exist $u_i, v_i \in U$ and $p_i \in P$ such that $v_i(u_i x_i - p_i) = 0$. If $t = v_1 \ldots v_n u_1 \ldots u_n$, then $t \in (P : M) \cap U$, which is a contradiction. □

The following is an immediate consequence of Theorem 1.5.

**Corollary 1.6.** *Let $M$ be a finitely generated $R$-module and $U$ be a multiplicatively closed subset of $R$. Then there is a bijective inclusion-preserving mapping*

$$\begin{aligned} \{P \in \text{S-Spec}_R M | (P : M) \cap U = \emptyset\} &\longrightarrow \text{S-Spec}_{U^{-1}R}U^{-1}M \\ P &\longmapsto U^{-1}P. \end{aligned}$$

*whose inverse is also inclusion-preserving.*

Let $N$ be a proper submodule of $M$. The *strongly prime radical* of $N$ in $M$, denoted s-rad$(N)$, is defined to be the intersection of all strongly prime submodules of $M$ containing $N$. If there is no strongly prime submodule containing $N$, then we put s-rad$(N) = M$.

We conclude this section with a good justification for the study of strongly prime submodules. In fact, as it mentioned in the introduction it is not true that every semiprime submodule of an $R$-module $M$ is an intersection of prime submodules, see Jenkins and Smith (1992), but our next theorem shows that as in the ideal case, this is true for strongly semiprime submodules.

**Theorem 1.7.** *Let $C$ be a strongly semiprime submodule of an $R$-module $M$. Then $C$ is an intersection of some strongly prime submodules of $M$.*

*Proof.* It is enough to show that s-rad$(C) \subseteq C$. Let $x \in M \setminus C$. We define $T = \{x_0, x_1, \ldots\}$ inductively as follows: $x_0 = x$, $x_1 \in I^C_{x_0} x_0 \setminus C$, $x_2 \in I^C_{x_1} x_1 \setminus C$,..., etc.

Set

$$\Omega = \{K \leq M \,|\, C \subseteq K,\ K \cap T = \emptyset\}.$$

$\Omega \neq \emptyset$, since $C \in \Omega$. Then by Zorn's lemma $\Omega$ has a maximal element, say $P$. We claim that $P$ is a strongly prime submodule of $M$. Suppose on the contrary that $x, y \in M \setminus P$ and $I_x^P y \subseteq P$. Since $x, y \notin P$, we have $(P + Rx) \cap T \neq \emptyset$ and $(P + Ry) \cap T \neq \emptyset$. So there exist $r_1, r_2 \in R$ and $p_1, p_2 \in P$ and $x_i, x_j \in T$ such that $p_1 + r_1 x = x_i$ and $p_2 + r_2 y = x_j$. We have

$$I_{x_i}^C(x_j - p_2) \subseteq I_{x_i}^P(x_j - p_2) = I_{r_1x+p_1}^P(x_j - p_2) \subseteq I_x^P(x_j - p_2) = I_x^P r_2 y \subseteq I_x^P y \subseteq P$$

If $i \geq j$, then there exists $a \in R$ such that $x_i = ax_j$ and hence

$$I_{x_i}^C(x_i - p_2) = I_{x_i}^C(ax_j - p_2) \subseteq I_{x_i}^C(x_j - p_2) \subseteq P.$$

Since $x_{i+1} \in I_{x_i}^C x_i$, we have $x_{i+1} \in P$, which is a contradiction. If $i < j$, then there exists $b \in R$ such that $x_j = bx_i$ and hence

$$I_{x_j}^C(x_j - p_2) = I_{bx_i}^C(x_j - p_2) \subseteq I_{x_i}^C(x_j - p_2) \subseteq P.$$

Since $x_{j+1} \in I_{x_j}^C x_j$, we have $x_{j+1} \in P$, which is again a contradiction. Therefore $P$ is a strongly prime and hence $x \notin \text{s-rad}(C)$ and the proof is complete. □

## 2. A Generalized Principal Ideal Theorem for Modules

The Generalized Principal Ideal Theorem (GPIT) states that if $R$ is a Noetherian rings and $\mathfrak{p}$ is a minimal prime ideal of an ideal $(a_1, \ldots, a_n)$ generated by $n$ elements of $R$, then $\text{ht}\mathfrak{p} \leq n$. Consequently, $\text{ht}(a_1, \ldots, a_n) \leq n$, where for an ideal $I$ of $R$, $\text{ht}I$ denotes the height of $I$.

Krull proved this theorem by induction on $n$. The case $n = 1$ is then the hardest part of the proof. Krull called the $n = 1$ case the Principal Ideal Theorem (PIT).

*Remark* 2.1. The PIT is one of the cornerstones of dimension theory for Noetherian rings, see Eisenbud (1995, Theorem 10.1). Indeed, Kaplansky (1974, page 104) call it "the most important single theorem in the theory of Noetherian rings".

It is natural to ask if the GPIT can be extended to modules. Nishitani (1998), has proved that the GPIT holds for modules. The aim of this section is to give an alternative generalization of GPIT to modules. For this purpose we need to define some notions.

Let $P$ be a strongly prime submodule of $M$. We shall say that $P$ is *strongly minimal prime* over a submodule $N$ of $M$, if $N \subseteq P$ and there does not exist a strongly prime submodule $L$ of $M$ such that $N \subseteq L \subset P$.

**Definition 2.2.** (1) Let $P$ be a strongly prime submodule of $M$. The *strong height* of $P$, denoted s-ht$_R P$, is defined by

$$\text{s-ht}_R P = \sup\{n | \exists\ P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_n \in \text{S-Spec}_R M \text{ such that } P_0 \subset P_1 \subset \cdots \subset P_n = P\}.$$

(2) Let $N$ be a proper submodule of an $R$-module $M$. The *strong height* of $N$, denoted s-ht$_R N$, is defined by

$$\text{s-ht}_R N = \min\{\text{s-ht}_R P | P \in \text{S-Spec}_R M,\ P \text{ is strongly minimal prime over } N\}.$$

**Theorem 2.3.** *Let $R$ be a ring and $M$ be a Noetherian flat $R$-module. Let $N$ be a proper submodule of $M$ generated by $n$ elements $x_1, \ldots, x_n \in M$. Then* s-ht$_R N \leq n$.

*Proof.* Replacing $R/(0 : M)$ by $R$, we can assume that $R$ is a Noetherian ring. Let s-ht$_R N = \ell$. Then there is a submodule $P$ of $M$ such that $P$ is strongly minimal prime over $N$ and s-ht$_R P = \ell$. Let $\mathfrak{p} = (P : M)$ and $U = R \setminus \mathfrak{p}$. By Corollary 1.6, s-ht$_R N$ = s-ht$_{U^{-1}R} U^{-1} N$. Thus replacing $U^{-1}R$ by $R$, we can assume that $R$ is a Noetherian local ring with maximal ideal $\mathfrak{p}$. Because $M$ is a flat module over a local ring, it is free with finite rank, say $m$. Since $M/P$ is an $R/\mathfrak{p}$-vector space and (0) is a strongly prime submodule of $M/P$, by Proposition 1.3, we have $\dim_{R/\mathfrak{p}} M/P = 1$. Hence there exists a basis $\{e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_m\}$ for $M$ such that $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_{m-1} \in P$ and $e_m \notin P$. We have $P = Re_1 + Re_2 + \ldots + Re_m + \mathfrak{p}e_m$. There are elements $a_{1j}, a_{2j}, \ldots, a_{m-1j} \in R$ and $a_{mj} \in \mathfrak{p}$ such that $x_j = a_{1j}e_1 + a_{2j}e_2 + \ldots + a_{mj}e_m$. Let $\mathfrak{q}$ be a minimal prime ideal over an ideal $(a_{m1}, a_{m2}, \ldots, a_{mn})$ and $Q$ denotes the

submodule $Re_1 + Re_2 + \ldots + Re_m + \mathfrak{q}e_m$. Since $M/Q \cong R/\mathfrak{q}$, $Q$ is a strongly prime submodule and hence $P = Q$, by the minimality of $P$. Hence $\mathfrak{p} = \mathfrak{q}$ holds and so $\mathfrak{p}$ is a minimal prime over an ideal generating by $n$ elements. Since s-ht$_R P = \ell$, we can consider the following chain of distinct strongly prime submodules of $M$

$$P_0 \subset P_1 \subset \ldots \subset P_\ell = P.$$

We claim that the above chain induces a chain

$$(P_0 : M) \subset (P_1 : M) \subset \ldots \subset (P_\ell : M) = \mathfrak{p}$$

of distinct prime ideals of $R$. It is enough to show that $(P_0 : M) \subset (P_1 : M)$. The containment $(P_0 : M) \subseteq (P_1 : M)$ is always true. Suppose that $(P_0 : M) = (P_1 : M)$. Then for any $x \in P_1 \setminus P_0$ and any $y \in M$, we have

$$I_x^{P_0} y \subseteq I_x^{P_1} y = \{r \in R | rM \subseteq P_1\} y = (P_1 : M) y = (P_0 : M) y \subseteq P_0.$$

Since $P_0$ is strongly prime and $x \notin P_0$, we have $y \in P_0$ and hence $P_0 = M$ which is a contradiction. Thus $(P_0 : M) \subset (P_1 : M)$. Now by the GPIT for rings, we have $\ell \leq \text{ht}_R \mathfrak{p} \leq n$. This completes the proof. □

## Acknowledgments

I thank Javad Asadollahi for his suggestions and comments. I also thank the referee for many careful comments, and Sharekord University for the financial support.

## References

[1] Behboodi, M., Karamzadeh, O. A. S., Koohy, H. (2004). Modules whose certain submodules are prime, *Vietnam J. Math*, 32(3):303-317.

[2] Camillo, V. P. (1975). On some rings whose modules have maximal submodules, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 55:97-100.

[3] Dauns, J. (1978). Prime modules, *J. Reine Angew. Math.* 298:156-181.

[4] Dauns, J. (1980). Prime modules and one-sided ideals. *Lecture Notes Pure Appl. Math.* 55:301-344.

[5] Eisenbud, D. (1995). *Commutative Algebra with a View Toward Algebraic Geometry*, Springer-Verlag, New York.

[6] Faith, C. (1976). *Algebra II*, Ring Theory, Springer-Verlag, Berlin-New York.

[7] Faith, C. (1995). Locally perfect commutative rings are those whose modules have maximal submodules, *Comm. Algebra* 23(13):4885-4886.

[8] Hamsher, R. (1967). Commutative rings over which every module has a maximal submodule, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* 18:1133-1137.

[9] Hirano, Y. (1998). On rings over which each module has a maximal submodule, *Comm. Algebra* 26(10):3435-3445.

[10] Jenkins, J., Smith, P. F. (1992). On the prime radical of a module over a commutative ring, *Comm. Algebra* 20(12):3593-3602.

[11] Kaplansky, I. (1974). *Commutative Rings*, Revised Edition, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

[12] Koifman, L. A. (1970). Rings over which every module has a maximal submodule, *Math. Zametki* 7:359-367.

[13] Man, S. H., Smith, P. F. (2002). On chains of prime submodules, *Israel J. Math.* 127:131-155.

[14] McCasland, R. L., Moore, M. E., Smith, P. F. (1997). On the spectrum of a module over a commutative ring, *Comm. Algebra* 25(1):79-103.

[15] McCasland, R. L., Smith, P. F. (1993). Prime submodules of Noetherian modules, *Rocky Mountain J. Math.* 23(3):1041-1062.

[16] Moore, M. E., Smith, S. J. (2002). Prime and radical submodules of modules over commutative rings. *Comm. Algebra* 30(10):5037-5064.

[17] Nishitani, I. (1998). A generalized principal ideal theorem for modules over a commutative ring, *Comm. Algebra* 26(6):1999-2005.

A.R. Naghipour, Department of Mathematics, Shahrekord University, P.O.Box 115, Shahrekord, Iran

*E-mail address*: Naghipour@sci.sku.ac.ir